

Radical Abolitionist.

EXTRA.

NEW YORK, JUNE 2, 1856.

NATIONAL NOMINATION

BY THE

Radical Abolitionists.

For President,

GERRIT SMITH, OF NEW YORK.

For Vice-President,

SAMUEL MCFARLAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

At a NATIONAL CONVENTION of Abolitionists, held at Syracuse, N. Y., May 28th and 29th, 1856, the above nominations were unanimously made, and the Convention, after mature consideration, and earnest discussion, unanimously adopted the following

ADDRESS.

To the Abolitionists of the United States:

ALL human beings belong to one and the same brotherhood. Nay, the sum of them all is but a unit. Whoever fails to recognize this relationship and this oneness, and the obligations from man to man—from all men to all men—resulting therefrom, cannot act with much intelligence or usefulness in the high and holy sphere of politics. We call it high and holy—the vulgar and low apprehensions of it to the contrary notwithstanding. We call it such, not because of its present and actual state, but of its original and theoretical character—not to describe what bad men have made it, but what good men are bound to make it, and what they certainly will make it, whenever they shall unite to rescue it from the corrupt influences, that control it, and to redeem it from the horrible abuses, that crowd it.

In the sphere of politics, as well as elsewhere, not only is every man to see in every other man a brother and another self; but he is also to see in himself his "brother's keeper"—and, that too, even though the brother dwell on the opposite side of the earth. But if distance does not release men from fraternal care for each other, neither are they released from it by being under different civil governments. These governments, rightly understood, are nothing else than institutions, or arrangements whereby all men can more effectually care for all men. Whenever one of these governments proves itself to be incurably perverted to the infliction of unendurable wrongs, the whole human brotherhood is to be held finally responsible for its overthrow. Such would be its responsibility in the case of the Russian Government, should that Government fall to murdering its subjects, and they be unable to resist their murderer. This responsibility of the human brotherhood would grow out of its original and never-surrendered right, and therefore never-cancelled obligation to protect itself and every part of itself. We say not, that the wrong is, in any instance, to be corrected by physical force. We admit, that the exertion of moral influence is by far the "more excellent way." We admit too, that the brotherhood, were its character what it should be, would have the competent amount of moral influence. Nay, we also admit, that

had it such a character, there would never be an occasion for the interposition of the brotherhood. All we say is, that whatever the means it may employ, the brotherhood must not fail to have the wrong corrected.

The people of the world are divided into families; and family government is to be held sacred both by those within and those without the family. Nevertheless, wherever it is made the instrument of insufferable cruelty, and the scourge and destroyer, instead of the protector and blessing, of the family, there is a proper occasion for interposing with the paramount authority of the human brotherhood, and for casting aside the subordinate and abused authority. Is a husband beating his wife, or a father torturing his child, the neighbors are bound, in the absence of a protective police, to hasten to the rescue. Their right to do so is this same inalienable right of the brotherhood to protect itself—to protect itself, at whatever hazard, and at the necessity of crossing whatever family, as well as whatever State boundaries. Is the Canadian Government so wicked, as to be maiming its subjects? —then must the people of our contiguous States arouse themselves, in the name of universal man, to sweep aside that Government, and deliver their outraged brethren. So, too, if the Governments on our South are wicked enough to reduce their subjects to beasts of burden, and label them as chattels, we are bound (and by so much the more, as to enslave a people, and thereby their posterity also, is worse than to maim or even murder them,) to wield the powers of the human brotherhood for the subversion of these Governments.

It will be seen in the light of what we have said, that we recognize a higher earthly authority than a State or National Government. It is that of the human family over all its members—that of the whole over the whole. Very rarely, indeed, is this authority to be resorted to. Never, save in those extreme cases of which we have given illustrations. In all but such cases this government of the brotherhood is never to interfere with the civil government. It is never to feel itself called on to put an end to wrongs, which human patience can possibly bear, or which there is any reason to hope the civil government will terminate and redress.

Revolution is a well nigh universally admitted right. But the revolution which we are advocating, is immeasurably broader than the accepted idea of revolution. The one is the right of the subject to use against his civil government. The other is the right of the world to overthrow that government.

The doctrine of 'Non-Intervention,' as inculcated by Kossuth and others, meets with wide acceptance. Nevertheless, we affirm, that the doctrine, which ignores the right of our crushed brethren to our help, because they happen to be remote from us, or under another government, is unreasonable and unnatural, cruel and base. It is full of treason to God and man. Were the Hungarian Government murdering its subjects, then would the Russians, by that everlasting law of humanity and love, which no distance, and no statutes, and no constitutions can nullify, be authorized to stop it. By the same law would the people of Ohio be authorized to deliver their brethren in Kentucky from a worse fate than murder, should deliverance come from no more appropriate source.

It is in the name then of the human brotherhood,

that we demand the abolition of American slavery; for we both admit and maintain its right—the right of France or England, or of any other part of the human brotherhood—to abolish it, provided America shall fail to abolish it. On no narrower ultimate ground than this are we willing to rest the obligation to rid the world of this conspiracy against human nature—of this greatest outrage on human rights—of this greatest insult to the human brotherhood. Here would the American slaves have it rested. Here would all have it rested, who should be so unfortunate as to fall under the yoke of slavery. In that calamitous event, they would, if needful for their deliverance, have all the governments of the earth array themselves against the government which held them in slavery. If then there are any, who refuse to go with us at this point, it is because they refuse to do unto others, as they would have others do unto them: or, to use plainer words, it is because they refuse to be honest. For ourselves, we prefer to take positions which will not be ever disturbing our self-respect, by ever accusing us of dishonesty. In short, we prefer to take positions—and to take them openly, boldly, decidedly—from which we can have the courage to look our enslaved brethren in the face, and from which too we can with conscious uprightness, look into the face of Him, who is the Common Father of the enslaved and free; and in whose sight and in whose heart the various races of men are all equal.

Within the last few years many thousands have come to demand the abolition of all American slavery, on the ground, that the Constitution calls for such abolition. This is right. We too demand it on this ground, as well as on the broader ground, which we have been commanding. At the same time we admit, most freely and distinctly, that were the Constitution as full of provisions for slavery, as it is of provisions against slavery; and as full of provisions for its perpetuity as for its immediate termination, the obligation of the American people, or, in case of their default, the obligation of any other people, to abolish it, would, nevertheless, according to our theory of human rights, and of the duties of the human brotherhood, remain unimpaired.

We have referred to the Constitution. How amazing, that all intelligent and honest minds are not yet disabused of the impression, that it is pro-slavery! How amazing, that an instrument, which, under the rules of interpretation, applied by the Courts to all other legal papers, says not, and cannot possibly be made to say, one word for slavery or even one word about slavery—how amazing, that it should still pass, with such minds, for a pro-slavery instrument! And all the more amazing is it, since the instrument abounds in powers, which, if only turned in that direction, would at once be fatal to all the pretensions, and to the whole existence of slavery. It cannot be always—it cannot be much longer—that the people will, in spite of the obvious and glaring anti-slavery and abolition character of the Constitution, mistake the slaveholders' interpretation of that instrument for the instrument itself.

We do not deny, that a few of the members of the Convention, which framed the Constitution, manifested a desire to get slavery into it. Nevertheless, we deny that it was possible to get it in, against the foregone conclusion to have the Constitution wear a clean

and fair face for liberty. Moreover, we have the testimony of the *whole* Convention, near the close of its proceedings, that slavery was not in the Constitution. In avowing as their reason for striking out "servitude" and supplying its place with service, *that the former denotes the condition of slaves and the latter that of freemen*, they virtually declared their purpose to keep the Constitution clear of slavery; and they virtually declared also, that any contrary purpose, which they might have had entertained at a previous stage of the Convention, was now repented of, and abandoned. It is worthy of remark, that the definitions thus put upon these words were doubtless the popular definitions. But if the people defined them, as their representatives did, how then can we be at liberty to say, that the people, when voting for the Constitution, saw slavery in those clauses, which contain the word "service."

We do not however positively deny, that the people would have adopted the Constitution, even if it had been framed to protect slavery:—for though improbable to the last degree, that they would have done so, we, nevertheless, cannot unqualifiedly affirm, that they would not. But what we do deny at this point is, that the Constitution was so framed; and what further we deny is, that an instrument can, by the legal rules of interpretation, be construed to favor slavery or any other gross and palpable injustice, unless it be expressly, clearly, certainly framed to that end. Says the Supreme Court of the United States: "Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the laws is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with irresistible clearness to induce a court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects." 2nd Cranch, 390.

That the Constitution is pro-slavery, is a mere inference:—and, what is more, this mere inference is deduced from another mere inference. From the fact that slavery existed among the American people at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, it is inferred that they were pro-slavery in their spirit and purpose; and from this inference it is inferred that they made the Constitution to breathe this spirit, and conform to this purpose. But both inferences are illegitimate and unsound. The latter is so, because what the Constitution is, in regard to slavery, can be ascertained only from the Constitution. If that instrument is expressly, clearly, certainly in favor of that most stupendous fraud and atrocious piracy, then, and only then, can it be held to be for slavery;—for then, and only then, can it be so held, according to those perfectly reasonable and absolutely necessary rules of interpretation, which the courts apply to every other gross and palpable injustice; and which, but for their shameless subservience to it, they would apply to slavery also. The former of the two inferences referred to is, as well as the other, illegitimate and unsound, because it is in the face of the fact—both philosophic and historical fact—that our revolutionary fathers were anti-slavery, instead of pro-slavery. They were fresh converts to the doctrines of impartial liberty, and the equal rights of all men:—and, like other fresh converts, their hearts were glowing with the fervors of their new faith. Moreover, what pecuniary or sordid temptation could they have had to continue slavery, when the price of one able-bodied slave was but two hundred dollars? or, in other words, but a fifth or a tenth of the present price? No greater was such temptation than would be that of our farmers to make wheat their principal crop, were the price of it reduced to twenty-five cents a bushel. But it will be asked why, if slavery was then so unprofitable, and so offensive to the public moral sense, were not specific laws enacted for its suppression? The answer is because all thought of the necessity of such laws was excluded by the very natural and confident expectation, that slavery, then dying so fast of itself, would not survive that generation.

The error of concluding that our revolutionary fa-

thers were pro-slavery, springs from the mistake of taking our stand point in the case amidst the pro-slavery interests and influences of the present day, instead of the anti-slavery interests and influences of their day.

Newspapers which advocate the pro-slavery construction of the Constitution, such as the Liberator and Anti-slavery Standard, are continually justifying that construction by the fact, that scarcely had the Constitution gone into operation, before it began to be used, as it has ever since been, for slavery. But this fact is answered by another fact—by the fact, that scarcely had it gone into operation, before Whitney's cotton gin was invented. None need be told, that it was this sorrow-fraught invention, which revived expiring slavery, and expanded it into the mighty and ruling interest of the country. Nor need any be told, that whenever and wherever slavery is in the ascendant, it is a law unto itself, and does whatever it will, all constitutions and all courts too, to the contrary notwithstanding. Slavery has claimed and done what it has claimed and done, not at all in the spirit of obedience to the Constitution—not at all in acknowledgment of the limitations of law—but solely as it was prompted by its own lawless rapacity. Slavery is as lawless as liberty is lawful. Its brutality, the present session of Congress, illustrates but its universal lawlessness. It was slavery—the spirit and education of slavery—that prompted Rust to fall upon the fearless and intellectual Greeley; that prompted Herbert to murder the innocent Keating; and Brooks to make those cruel gashes in the head of the brave and eloquent Sumner. But, in all this, slavery only acted out its ever lawless nature. Happy for our guilty country, if these outrages shall serve to impress the lesson, that for what is so essentially and necessarily lawless, there can be no law. Poor Keating probably partook of the general delusion, and thought slavery to be law. But, in the clearer light of eternity, he thinks so no longer. Since his beating, Greeley has confessed that no law for slavery is to be found in the Constitution. And now, if our beloved and honored Sumner, whose personal injuries awaken the tenderest sympathy of this great Convention on the one hand, and its deepest indignation on the other, shall be helped by these injuries to the conviction that slavery is not law, then shall we rejoice in his new knowledge, notwithstanding the great price at which he will have purchased it. We go further, and say, that we would very readily consent to have the ruffians of slavery knock hard the heads of such men as Seward and Chase, and Giddings and Hale, and Wilson and Wade, if only there might thereby be knocked out of those noble heads the utter nonsense that slavery is law—the utter nonsense, that the most lawless of all lawless things, and the most wrongful of all wrongful things, murder itself not excepted, justly challenges the reverence and obedience due to law.

Slavery will continue its lawless outrages in Kansas and Washington, as well as upon its plantations, just as long as the statesmen of the North shall be so foolish as to admit its sacred legality. No sooner, however, shall they begin to pronounce it an outlaw—the most naked and infamous of all outlaws—than it will see there is nothing left to itself but to die. There may be a majority of Republicans in both Houses of Congress; and a Republican President also;—nevertheless, slavery will be as rampant and murderous as ever—for it will still be an acknowledged law and a conceded right. But only elect abolitionists in their stead, and slavery will be as harmless as any other dying or dead animal.

A word more respecting Senator Sumner. Let it not be argued, that our regard for him must be small, since we could be as unkind as, in this hour of his affliction, to refer to his fault. The abolitionists are surpassed by no class of persons in their love for Charles Sumner. But they love the four millions of slaves also:—and every minute in the day there are outrages on the persons of slaves, tenfold crueler than

that which he has just suffered at the hands of one whose expulsion from his seat in Congress should be but a small part of the heavy punishment due to his heavy crime. The slavery-trained and slavery-be-gotten Brookses are innumerable in every part of the South. Every slave is liable to meet them at every moment. And, then, our noble senator had friends to rescue him from *his* brutal Brooks. But, alas, the slave is allowed no helper. Friends he has, but the offices of their friendship are forbidden.

Could there, by any possibility, be a law for this assault on Mr. Sumner? None more prompt than he to say "no." We put it to him then—how can he longer consent to acknowledge a law for the crueler assaults upon the slaves?—or, what is the same thing, for their enslavement? And we ask him too to remember, that it is because he and the other statesmen of the North do acknowledge such a law, that slavery continues. We, abolitionists, acknowledge no such law; and we would go straight-forward to deliver every slave. But Senator Sumner and his distinguished associates throw themselves across our path. Nay, they are the leaders of the Republican party—of that party which says, that the slaves are held, and scourged, and murdered by law; and that it, therefore, has neither the right nor the disposition to deliver them. How long, O, how long, is this spirit of folly and madness to sway these great and good men! God grant that Charles Sumner's present sufferings may enlighten him, and that he may leave his sick chamber with the heart of an abolitionist, and to engage in the work of an abolitionist.

But to return. Another answer to these newspapers which advocate the pro-slavery construction of the Constitution, is that what proves too much proves nothing. If the graspings of the slave-power prove the pro-slavery character of the Constitution, then is it proved by the Congress-created slavery of the District of Columbia; by the Congress-regulated slave-trade along the coast; by the Congress-enacted fugitive slave-law; by the Congress-opened way for slavery into the Territories; by the Federal-Judiciary-sanctioned inter-State slave-trade, and by the present struggle to get that Judiciary to establish slavery in the free States, in defiance of State laws and State rights. But even these newspapers will admit, that everything in this enumeration of the graspings of the slave-power is clearly unconstitutional.

The summing up of all this matter is, that the Constitution has been held to be pro-slavery, because a pro-slavery public sentiment has interpreted it. The anti-slavery sentiment, which is now rising and spreading over the land, calls for an anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution, and for the wielding of its anti-slavery powers, to the overthrow of all American slavery. How sad that some of our noblest and foremost anti-slavery men should be tempted by their unfortunate theories and positions to cling to these passing-away pro-slavery constructions of the Constitution!

We need say no more of the Constitution. We rejoice, that its powers to abolish every part and parcel of American slavery are fast coming to be acknowledged on all sides. We rejoice, that they have been recently pointed out even on the floor of Congress, and that too, in a brave and manly and telling way. We rejoice in the hope, that the abolition character of the Constitution will soon be extensively acknowledged both in the National and in State halls of legislation. But all this rejoicing falls very far short of a counterbalance to our deep and unfeigned grief, that so large a share of you, who have faith in this true interpretation of the Constitution, are still guilty of abjuring it in your practice. You are so inconsistent as to vote for men, who do not accept this interpretation: and moreover, so great is your lack of self-respect, that you can vote even for those who scoff at it, and at you for holding it.

At the presidential election of 1848 the great mass of abolitionists voted with a party based on a very qualified and narrow and only negative opposition to slavery. They flattered themselves, that their

votes would promote the abolition of slavery. But they were deceived. Slavery triumphed, and this party perished. In 1852 they voted with another such party; and of course voted in vain, and worse than in vain. Slavery was never stronger than in the results of that election. This absurd party died as speedily as did its absurd predecessor. Another and more absurd party has now risen up to take the place of these dead ones; to live in its turn, through its brief hour, as they lived through theirs; and then like them to be remembered only for its folly—its consummate folly—in expending zeal and strength—honest zeal and great strength—upon false and inadequate issues. Preeminently absurd as is this party, there is but too much reason to believe, that most of you will vote with it, at the coming presidential election. For the mass of abolitionists, whether from their generosity or hopefulness, or from their credulity and simplicity, seem fated to join every sham anti-slavery party, that turns up in the political world, ere they can become willing to identify themselves with the only true one. It is indeed no small consolation, that the Republican party, being the very perfection and climax of these shams, will, in all probability, be the last of them. When this party, in which folly has reached its culminating point, shall be overthrown, our abolition brethren, whom it has deluded, will, we trust, return to us to go no more out forever.

The presses of the Republican party insist, that abolitionists are all bound to join it: and they have already begun to hold up, as dishonest and pro-slavery, such of us, as refuse to join it. Presses, such as in 1844 denounced us as hypocrites and as in league with their opponents, merely because in our integrity and consistency we refused to vote for a slaveholder, are now visiting us with similar denunciations, because we refuse to join the Republican party. But what is this party, that an abolitionist should join it? Is it an abolition party? On the contrary, its disclaimers of all purpose and even of all right to abolish slavery are distinct and emphatic, and repeated from morning till night. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that it relies for success more on the ingratiating power of these disclaimers than on any or all things else. The Republican party an abolition party! Why, it does not propose to abolish slavery even in the District of Columbia. We admit that it opposes the spread of slavery in a certain direction, and earnestly seeks a triumph for liberty in Kansas. Nevertheless, it is, all this time, endorsing the constitutionality and legality of slavery; and is leaving, and in effect fastening, the chains of slavery upon nearly four millions of its countrymen. Thus large is the price which the Republican party is willing to pay for victory. But magnify the importance of that victory as you will, it will still cost too much—infinitely too much,—the poor weary slaves being judges.

And how unreasonable is it to bid us join the Republican party in the hope, that it may build itself up on its narrow and but negatively anti-slavery platform into a positive abolition party! It has, in advance, cut itself off from all possibility of such improvement. The implications, not to say the express pledges, of its position, forbid its ever attempting the abolition of slavery. How then can we, if we mean to remain abolitionists, join the Republican party? But we do mean to remain abolitionists, and we do mean to remain honorable men:—and, therefore, though without at all questioning the consistency or honor of the mere anti-administration man, who joins it, or the simple opponent of slavery extension, who does so, we ourselves cannot join it. It may be all right to ask us to give up our abolition, and join that party. But whoever asks us to join it, notwithstanding our abolition, virtually accuses us of the lack of principle, and betrays his own lack of it.

We ask again what is the Republican party that an abolitionist should join it? Does it propose to abolish the traffic in slaves between the States?—or that which is carried on along the coast under the protection and regulations of Congress? Neither. And

will not its silence regarding both be fairly claimed to be, if not its virtual endorsement of both, nevertheless its virtual acquiescence in both? Moreover, what says it of the fugitive slave act? Not one word. Its silence regarding that abomination will also be construed, if not into justification of it, at least into acquiescence in it. We add, that although in regard to certain things in Kansas, the Republican party takes brave issue with the slaveholders, it nevertheless sanctions their claim to make her as well as every other portion of our country, an everlasting hunting ground, in which men shall be the prey, and slavery their doom.

We ask again, what is the Republican party, that our union with it could be justified? What says it of the obvious purpose of the slave-power to over-ride State laws and State rights, (as it is now endeavoring to do in Pennsylvania and New York,) and to leave no State in all the Union, through which the slaveholder shall not have the admitted right to drive his *cattle*, whip in hand; to insult liberty in her own presence, and brow-beat her in her own home; to debauch every part of the American people, by familiarizing every part with the sight of slavery; and to prepare the way for universal acquiescence in every claim and every outrage of slavery? Of all this it says nothing. Its ignoring policy extends to all this also.

We must not however regard it as inconsistent in the Republican party to offer no resistance to this impudent attempt to force slavery into the free States. It is entirely consistent with itself at this point. It admits the legality of slavery in Virginia. Why then should it not bear with, and even approve, the attempt to get its legality recognized in Pennsylvania also? Does the objector say that it should not, for the reason, that, whilst the laws of Virginia authorize slavery, the laws of Pennsylvania forbid it?—that whilst the *lex loci* in the one case sanctions it, the *lex loci* in the other does not? But let us look into this objection to see how empty of all force it is. What is slavery? It is the assumption of the rights of property in man. But all rights of property are natural rights—natural in Virginia and natural everywhere. Laws cannot create them, nor destroy them. They can but protect them. Henry Clay's celebrated dogma, that what the laws make property is property, is an absurdity. To admit then, as the Republican party does, the obligation and sacredness of slave laws in Virginia, is to admit that the rights of property in man exist there, and to admit that such rights exist there, is to admit that they exist everywhere, and can be denied and destroyed nowhere. Hence we repeat, that the Republican party is entirely consistent with itself at this point; and it will be none the less so, if, instead of quietly suffering slavery to be set up in the free States, it shall set it up in them with its own hands.

But we shall be told, that our reasoning at this point is all unsound because the proposition, on which it is built—the proposition that the rights of property are natural—is all unsound. We shall be told that Virginia and New York are competent to make what they will *property*, and what they will *not property*—and that this is illustrated on the one hand by establishing slavery in Virginia, and thus making men property there, and on the other by forbidding slavery in New York and thus making men not property there. But, as we shall see in a moment, they, who employ these illustrations of it, will nevertheless be found to repudiate the principle itself. Suppose that Virginia, feeling herself to be insulted and injured by this counter-legislation or policy of New York, shall retaliate and declare, that within her own jurisdiction cheese and hops and barley are not property; and that these articles, when brought to her markets by the farmers of New York, shall not have the protection of law. Will this retaliation be endured? Not for a moment. They will let Virginia outrage their colored brother; but they will not let her outlaw their cheese, hops and barley. They will let her make property of

that which is not property. But they will not let her reverse the transmutation, and make no property of that which is property. Yes, in the event of such outlawry of their property, the farmers of New York would scout the doctrine, that the rights of property stand in human enactments, and are simply the creations of the *lex loci*. In that event they would promptly fall back upon the doctrine of reason and common sense—the doctrine that what nature makes property is property. The truth is that both North and South, when interest tempts them to it, are found ready to take the ground, that the rights of property are natural and universal, not conventional and local. It is on this ground, that not a few at the South, have come to rest their claim to their slaves, and to emigrate with them whither they please. It is on this ground, that the Judge Kanes of the North open rest that claim. And all, both at the North and the South—Republicans as well as slaveholders—who admit that there can be a valid law for slavery anywhere, do, in effect, take this same ground. For, as we have seen—to admit that there can be a valid law for slavery anywhere is, virtually, to admit that the right of property in man is natural, and that there is therefore a valid law for it everywhere. Lord Mansfield virtually admitted it, even in those celebrated words, which abolitionists are so wont to quote, but which they will cease to quote, when they shall have come to see, that they are words for slavery, instead of against it. That eminent jurist says: "Slavery is so odious, that nothing can be suffered to support it but *positive* law. Here is the implication, that there can be rights of property in man in some circumstances. But if in some, then in all—for rights of property are natural and universal. Would Lord Mansfield have said that property can ever be else than property? But that would have been no less absurd than to say, that man could ever be property, —could ever be else than man.

Unbounded is our joy, that the widely extended and deeply-exciting discussions of slavery for the last quarter of a century have at last reached the one true great issue on this subject: IS PROPERTY IN MAN A NATURAL RIGHT? Or, in other words, DOES NATURE TEACH THAT MEN ARE CHATTELS? Involved in that great issue are many issues. In that only can the Lemmon case be fully and fairly tried. If property in man is a natural right—if there can be law for it anywhere—then give back to Lemmon his slaves, for then has he been wickedly and basely robbed of them. In that issue only can the Wheeler case of Philadelphia be fully and fairly tried. And he too has a very sinful and shameful robbery to be redressed, if to make merchandise of men is a natural right. In that only can be fully and fairly tried the question whether Kansas may be given up to slavery. If nature speaks for slavery; if nature declares that man is put in his proper place when put upon the auction-block—then let Kansas be overspread with slavery—for then will Kansas be blest with slavery. And only in that one true great issue, can the vast and momentous question be disposed of, whether, in any part of this broad land, immortal, godlike man can be left in slavery. If slavery is his natural condition, then leave not the South to enjoy a monopoly of the blessing—but let the North also and every part of the North share in it.

Such is this one true great issue, on which our whole nation is divided. The abolitionists are on one side, and all but the abolitionists are on the other. The abolitionists say, that man is not capable of reduction to chattelhood. All but abolitionists say that he is. They do not all say it expressly—but they all say it in effect.

In the light then of what has now been said on property in man, we see that just so sure as property is a natural right, just so sure is it that every one of the numberless times, in which the Republican party expresses its respect for the slave laws of the slave States it virtually expresses, not only its consent to haye, but its belief that there should be, such laws in

the free States also. We add, that the legitimate tendency of the creed of the Republican party at this point is to break down every dam that hinders the flood of slavery from pouring over the free States. We also add, that every creed, which acknowledges slave laws, and therefore the natural right of property in man, goes to license the people of every State, the people of every neighborhood, aye and the members of every family, to fall upon each other for the diabolical purpose of reducing each other to slavery. Such a creed quite carried out, and the human brotherhood would be turned into a herd of Ishmaelites, in which every man's hand would be "against every man, and every man's hand against him."

Let not the Republican party be deceived by its motto: "Slavery sectional; Freedom national."—Slavery sectional is, in principle, slavery national. To recognize its right to exist anywhere is to recognize its right to exist everywhere. This much vaunted motto is among the foolish fancies that will now and then float in the heads of even the wisest and best of men. In vain will the Republican party look for a half-way place between the doctrine of slavery everywhere and the doctrine of slavery nowhere. Republicans, in common with all their countrymen, are shut up to an election between slavery for all the land, or freedom for all the land.

Repeatedly have we asked—What is the Republican party, that we can have the right to join it? Freemen of the North are frequently seized, imprisoned, and sometimes sold into slavery—and all this for no other offence than their presuming to enter a slave State with a skin darker than that worn by some other men. What has the Republican party to say of this outrage? Nothing at all.

Again we ask wherein consists our right to join the Republican party? Is it in their motto: "No more slave States?" That was their motto; but it is no longer. Or rather it was the motto of Republicans, whilst as yet they were members of the Free-Soil and Free Democratic parties, and ere they had fallen to their present level. Incessantly and boastfully did they repeat it. But they had to fling it away when they adopted the policy of building a party on the lowest possible ground;—the policy, in other words, of swelling their numbers by discarding their principles. Even Kansas they now admit, has the right to be a slave State. And surely so long as they admit that Missouri has such right, why should they not admit, that Kansas also has it? To distinguish between the rights of States in this respect or in any other respect, is the veriest nonsense.

We must ask once more, what are the merits of the Republican party, that an abolitionist should join it? Is it prompted by sympathy with the black race, and by the purpose of obtaining equal justice for that cruelly-wronged race? Some of its members certainly are: but many of them certainly are not.—As a party, the Republicans have evidently drank in the spirit of the American Colonization Society.—Their policy, like that of this oppressive Society, goes to exclude that unhappy race from all rights and privileges, and even from all homes in this land. The Republican party, if it may be judged of, by the late Circular of its National Committee, has undertaken to banish the black race from the nation:—for, according to that Circular, it has undertaken to "make a constellation of free bright Republics *constituted of the white race alone*," and "to build up free States composed of white men." Can an Abolitionist join an atheistic party? But every party is atheistic that refuses equal justice to all the races of men. Every man is atheistic, so far as he refuses in any of the relations of life, political, ecclesiastical, or social, to recognize the brotherhood of all men; and who is too stupid or depraved to discern his brother under a skin however colored. That is not a christian State, which stigmatizes or cripples a portion of its innocent subjects, or which forbids dwelling-places within its borders to any portion of the human family.—Hence Kansas is not yet prepared to become a chris-

tian State:—and we add, that the cause of Kansas loses much of its power with good men, and more with God, by reason of her blasphemous insult to her colored brother, and to the God of her colored brother.

We proceed to ask in this connection, whether the Republican party commands itself to Abolitionists by its relation to the Know Nothing or Native American party? a party animated, as is slavery, by the hateful spirit of caste, and denying, as does slavery, natural and essential rights? Does it condemn this bigoted, intolerant, and proscriptive party? It does not. It refuses to condemn it. In vain was it asked to condemn it, at the Pittsburg Convention. It even courts and coalesces with that bad party—the labors of the honest and able editor of the National Era, and of many other Republican editors to the contrary notwithstanding. Its victories—very poor at the best—are, as the late elections in New England show, all partnership victories, in which the Know Nothings have been the great partner, and the Republicans the little one. We would add just here, that no duty of the abolitionist is plainer than to keep himself at the widest distance from all affinity with this Know Nothing party, and from every other party also, that is guilty of resolving natural rights into conventionalisms, and of making it but a question of expediency whether a man shall be allowed to vote. It is but a step from that wrong against human nature to the other wrong of reducing to mere calculation the question whether a man shall be allowed to own himself.

The great central and distinctive doctrine of the Abolition party is, that men have natural, and therefore inalienable rights. Among these is the right of self-ownership, and the right to vote, and the right of each to choose his religion. These natural and inalienable rights this party contends belong equally to the black and the white, the foreign-born and the native-born, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant. We add, that there are but two political parties, which either our foreign-born or our Roman Catholic citizens can consistently join. Such of them as believe in the doctrine of the human brotherhood, and therefore in the doctrine of the equal natural rights of all men, in whatever clime, or with whatever color they may have been born, or in whatever religion educated—such of them find their political party with us, and only with us. Such of them, in a word, are abolitionists;—for to be an abolitionist is nothing else than to acknowledge, honestly and practically, that all men are men, and have the rights of men.

We have said what party it is, that those of our foreign-born and Roman Catholic citizens, who are abolitionists, can consistently join. We proceed to name the appropriate party for those of them who are anti-abolitionists, despisers of human rights, and servile followers of demagogues. It is the Democratic party. For this portion of our foreign-born and Roman Catholic voters, all the wit of Satan could not have devised a more suitable or a more attractive party than that which so impudently and falsely calls itself a *Democratic* party.

We have asked repeatedly—what is the Republican party, that an abolitionist should join it? With a triumphant air will it be answered, that it is a party to restore the Missouri Compromise. We admit that it is a party for this purpose; and we affirm that it is a party for this purpose only. Some may give it credit for higher and better purposes, and others may charge upon it lower and worse. Nevertheless, in the light of all the revelations it has thus far made of itself, it is safe to assume that the sole object of the Republican party is to restore, in effect, if not in form, the Missouri Compromise. But, this being so, are abolitionists at liberty to join the Republican party?

The Missouri Compromise was the greatest curse which ever befel this nation. It was an open bargain between liberty and slavery,—and whenever liberty consents to bargain with slavery, she necessarily sinks herself and exalts her foe. It is true that

slavery had hitherto enjoyed same favors—shameless favors—in our legislation and diplomacy. Nevertheless, it was, on the whole, treated as infamous and vile. But now it was clothed with dignity and honor by this open recognition of its competence to negotiate and share with liberty. Hitherto slavery had been among us on sufferance more than by the force of its acknowledged legality. But now was conceded not only its right to exist, but also to provide for its growth and perpetuity. Hitherto slavery had been feeble; but now it became a mighty and overshadowing power in the land, because an admitted power. From that day to this, its progress has been irresistible; and so it will continue to be until the people shall have the wisdom to see, the honesty to confess, and the bravery to maintain, that slavery has no rights, and is no more entitled than naked murder, to the shelter or name of law.

No—abolitionists cannot join a party which would restore the Missouri compromise; which would renew this bargain between liberty and slavery, righteousness and robbery, heaven and hell. Much as we abhor the perfidy which broke it, we nevertheless rejoice that the accursed bargain is broken, and that the Missouri Compromise is no more. But would we not have Kansas free? Yes—and no class of persons is working so hard and so efficiently to this end as the abolitionists—no class so aroused by her abominable oppressions. But we would have her free, not in virtue of an insane agreement to have men on one side of a line of latitude count as men, and men on the other side of it count as chattels. We would have her free, simply because, by the everlasting distinctions between persons and property, men are men everywhere, and can be sunk to chattelhood nowhere. Resolved we are, that Kansas shall be free. Nevertheless, it is, in our esteem, infinitely better that she be blighted with slavery, than exempted from the curse at the expense of upholding it, or acquiescing in it elsewhere. Moreover, she cannot be sure to escape from the curse, nor can even Ohio or Massachusetts, or any other part of the land, unless the friends of freedom combine to banish it from every part of the land. No negative policy, no mere defensive anti-slavery can ensure protection from it. As slavery can live only by ceaseless aggressions upon the domain of liberty, so liberty can only live by ceaseless aggressions upon the usurpations of slavery. Liberty cannot fail to perish in her contest with slavery, if her policy is less positive and aggressive than that of slavery. As slavery knows no law to restrain its inroads upon liberty, so liberty must know no law to restrain her inroads upon slavery. Slavery is fully determined to rule everywhere; and liberty must be as determined that slavery shall rule nowhere. For such is slavery, that, so long as it is left to rule anywhere, there is no security that it will not, in the end, rule everywhere.

Strong is our hope that Kansas will be free. But this hope springs from no reliance on the expedients and tricks of selfishness. In vain will Kansas resort to these; for in the whole game of selfishness, the slave power will prove an overmatch for her. All she can get in that game, and in her bargains and compromises with slavery, will be but little, and even that little will be insecure forever.

No; our strong hope that Kansas will be free, springs from our strong hope that her harsh collision with slavery will have the effect to imbue her with the spirit, and establish her in the principles of our abolition party; and that it will have such effect, not in Kansas only, but over the whole North also, and to some extent, even in the South. Already is that collision making abolitionists very rapidly—not mere anti-slavery men, but downright abolitionists. And they are not such abolitionists as are wont to fall away to the enemy, when we have most need of their steadfastness and their votes. They are of another and better type. They are such Abolitionists as those who rescued Jerry at Syracuse;—and those who immortalized Christiana; and those

who, scattered among the brave defenders of the city of Lawrence last winter, were animated themselves, and were animating others by the power of the well-known Abolition principle—never to surrender, and never to compromise.

We expect that Kansas will be free, whether in the event of her being blessed with peace, or afflicted with war. If left to build up her institutions peacefully, we expect that there will be abolitionists among her people, sufficiently numerous and influential, to get those institutions fashioned after the patterns of liberty. And if the slave power, with even the continued alliance of the Federal Government, shall undertake by force and arms to carry slavery into Kansas, and to crush her outraged and bravely resisting people, then are we sure that Kansas will be free—for then are we sure that the whole land will be free. It would cost the life of American slavery to atone for the guilty undertaking. The blood shed in it, whether much or little, could be washed away by nothing less than all the blood of all American slavery. As yet, there are no State Governments in the slavery-ridden North; for that is not so much as the shadow of civil government, which does not promise protection to all the innocent upon its soil—to even the least infant, white or black, within its jurisdiction. But there will be State Governments when slavery shall resort to open force to gain possession of our national territories. They will start into being instantly, when evoked by violent and bloody attempts to extend slavery. And as soon as we shall have State Governments, both the invasions and the life of slavery will be ended. The monster will be driven back, not only from his invasions of Kansas, and from his invasions of the whole North, but even his home in the South will be to him a home no longer.

For the last day or two, the telegraphic wires have been telling us that the work of carrying slavery into Kansas by force and arms, and by the open co-operation of the Federal Government, has already begun; that the town of Lawrence is destroyed; that some of the friends of freedom are imprisoned, and others of them shot. Is this news true? Then have we already come to "the beginning of the end." Then is the speedy death of American slavery already made certain. Then is the Abolition party already seen to be the party for the hour. Then is it already seen, even by Republicans themselves, how tame is the Republican party, and how insufficient its weapons in the presence of such an enemy as slavery, when that enemy is in its conquering, ravaging, murdering moods. Again we ask, is this news true? And we solemnly add, *LET IT BE TRUE!* For if such outrages are indispensable to arouse the North to put an end to American slavery, then let there be such outrages. If we must suffer terribly before we will consent to do our duty, then let us suffer terribly.

We have attributed our confident hope of the freedom of Kansas, to the spirit and principles of our party. Are we asked—what is our party, that we should so commend it? We answer, it is not the party of the white men; it is not the party of the black men; but the party of all men; and the party of all men for the sake of all men. It is true that it is the only political party which stands by the millions of enslaved Americans. But, it is also true, that it is the only political party which stands by the several more millions of non-slaveholding whites in the slave States. To these millions of nominal freemen, deeply wronged and scarcely less debased and despised than the slaves, the Republican party holds out no hope. It ignores them both. But these poor whites are beginning to see, and will, ere long, in spite of the threats of tyrants, have the courage to say that the political Abolition party is their party, and will yet be their deliverer. Moreover, ours is a party that pities the slaveholders—a class of men whose cruel wrongs against the slaves and against the non-slaveholding whites of the South, are scarcely more cruel than the wrongs practiced against themselves by the false and flattering priests and

politicians, the greedy and godless merchants and manufacturers of the North. We love both the slaveholders and the slaves; and with equal fidelity to both, shall we continue to labor for the deliverance of both. We believe that many slaveholders, as well as many slaves, love us, and in secret pray for us; and we believe they would speak openly for us and for our cause, but for that terror of the whip in the one case, and that scarcely less terror of the public sentiment in the other, which cow the heart and palsy the tongue.

Are we asked again, what is our party? We answer, that, having planted itself on the principles of that better world, where there is not, never was, and never will be, either a slaveholder or a slave, it feels the mighty inspiration of those principles; is conscious of its strength; and confident of its success. We believe that strength is vouchsafed to men, who are true to God. "For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward Him." We believe that the righteous few are an overmatch for the wicked many. "If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them, five of you shall chase a hundred, and a hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight." Our success cannot be retarded by our foes; and it cannot be much longer retarded by our friends. Rapidly multiplying events indicate that it is at hand. Even the present year would witness our success, could it witness our union at the ballot-box. Such a union of our numbers would be immediately followed by triumphant accessions to our numbers.

We have spoken freely, but we hope not unjustly, of the Republican party. We confess that our words have done it great injustice, if they convey the idea that the party must necessarily remain upon its present low and narrow ground, and that all improvement of its character is therefore impossible. We have admitted its incapacity for improvement, whilst remaining on that false ground. But it may come to plant itself on the true ground, and so become essentially a new party. We have spoken of the Republican party as it now is, and not as it may hereafter be. It is, as yet, but a young party; and it may ripen into something far better than its present indications. Indeed, this seems quite possible, when we see how it abounds in strong and noble men, who are earnest and devoted friends of freedom, and whose only mistake is, that they will try the schemes of expediency once more, before they shall fall back upon the power of principle forever. Let us wait, at least, until the nomination of its candidates next month, before we utterly despair of the Republican party. We may then, instead of despairing of it, find it co-operating with us. True it is, that most of the presses of this party are just now seized with a very accommodating spirit, and are promising to be entirely satisfied with any candidates, provided only that they are opposed to cursing Kansas with slavery. But it is possible, that, by the time of its nominating Convention, the Republican party will not object to candidates who war upon slavery every where. It is even possible, that, by that time, it will have come to see that candidates who are not hostile to slavery every where, are not to be trusted for their hostility to it anywhere; and that he who is *for* slavery in Missouri, and *against* it in Kansas, may, under the pressure of temptation, declare for slavery in Kansas as well as in Missouri. Moreover, it is possible, that by that time, the Republican party may be convinced how entirely vain, as well as unprincipled, is its policy of making concessions to slavery, and of stipulating in advance that the monster may have the loaf, if but the crumbs shall be allowed to fall to the share of liberty. This conviction will prepare it to see, that to be a party to save any portion of the land from slavery, it must be a party to save the whole land from it. In other words, it must be an Abolition party.

No—so far are we from despairing of the Repub-

lican party, that we cannot entirely dismiss the hope that it will come to the support of the candidates whom we shall nominate this day. Even that large class of Republicans who say, "Any one for a candidate, though he be pro-slavery or even a slaveholder, if only he is for having Kansas a free State"—why may not even they vote for our candidates? No one doubts that our candidates will be for having Kansas a free State. And can it be that there are Republicans who, other things in the candidates being equal, will prefer those who are *for* slavery, to those who are *against* it? Surely we must not suspect Republicans of such infatuation. But, again, what rational hope of success can the Republican party have, if its candidates are any thing less than avowed thorough Abolitionists? None whatever. No type of anti-slavery, which falls short of abolition, can awaken the enthusiasm of the masses. But let the Republican party announce that the opponents of slavery have temporized and trifled long enough, and that the time has now come to put an end to slavery, and to overthrow that huge pile of villainy, and nonsense, and national disgrace and national trouble, and the masses will be wild with joy at the opportunity of getting rid of slavery. They will give to the winds their Know Nothingism, their spurious Democracy, their obsolete Whiggery, and all other hindrances, and rush to the polls in an irresistible torrent for liberty. Never yet have they had the prospect of getting rid of slavery. Hitherto the popular leaders of the anti-slavery public sentiment have told the masses not to join in a national movement for the abolition of American slavery, and they have reluctantly obeyed. But let them now declare that the time for such a movement has come, and the swift obedience of the masses will teach these leaders never again to distrust the passion of the people for liberty. We remark by the way, that none conceive themselves to be more profound judges of human nature than the magnates of the political world; and yet none are more shallow judges of it. Their schemes of expediency, as they ruffle but the surface, reveal but the surface of human nature. They shrink from having to do with those great radical truths which can alone stir its depths. What, for instance, is the little that can be learned of the soul of man—of his essential nature—by proposing to him a politico-economical plan for baffling one of the purposes of the slave-power, compared with the instructions of its mighty workings, when he is appealed to, in the name of the great God and of bleeding humanity, to deliver every slave?

Frequent are the complaints, that we require the Republican party to adopt all our views, before we can consent to co-operate with it. But we are not so unreasonable, so foolish, so intolerant. We are ready, not only to co-operate with it, but to merge ourselves in it, the very moment it shall take the ground, that there is no law for slavery—no real and obligatory law for sinking a man from manhood to chattelhood. Taking this ground, the Republican party would raise no person to the bench, who admits the legality of slavery, and would impeach every person on the bench who admits it. Taking this ground, it would leave it to that tribunal to kill slavery by the single declaration of its illegality—just as it is now left to that tribunal to kill other things that are illegal.

In asking that slavery be unknown to law, we ask nothing, that such men as Seward and Chase and Sumner, would not agree to, were they on the bench. As judges, they would know no law for slavery;—for were they themselves to fall under its yoke, and to stand trembling in the presence of a judge, they would have him know no law for slavery. And, surely, such men as Seward and Chase and Sumner are too honest to apply as law to others what, in no conceivable circumstances, they would have applied as law to themselves. Why then do such men hesitate to avow their connexion with the Abolition party? It is for them, and not for us to explain. Why, indeed, does not the greatest and stubbornest slave-

holder confess, that he himself belongs to the Abolition party?—for were he himself reduced to slavery, would not all the pains of his whipped and bleeding body convince him of the righteousness of that party, and would not all the agonies of his tortured soul testify, that in his soul, he belongs to it?

Because we prefer to have slavery disposed of in the ordinary way of disposing of what is illegal and unconstitutional, let it not be inferred, that we deny the constitutional power of Congress to legislate slavery out of existence. It has such power in respect to the whole system of American slavery. It has it, for instance, in its right to give freedom to all the slaves by giving citizenship to them. If, as we hold, they are already citizens, then are they already free. It has it, too, in its right to enrol, without any respect to slavery, black men as well as white men, in the militia and army;—a right, that will most certainly be exercised, should an earnest war be waged against us by a strong nation.

We need say no more. We believe that all we have said is true. We are willing to meet it all at the last day; for nothing of it has been said to please men, and all of it has been said to please God. We believe that there is no greater sin against the Maker of men than classing them with cattle; no greater insult to Him, in whose image they are made. We believe too, that the greatest wrong that can be done a man, and the greatest misery that can be brought upon him, is to enslave him. And we furthermore believe, that nothing so much as slavery in a nation goes to debauch and debase and imperil it; for it pours incessant floods of corruption through Church and State, and over the whole land. It threatens the whole American people, every State and Territory, with speedy convulsions—bloody, terrible, and ruinous convulsions. Now, believing all this, and that this deep dishonor to Heaven cannot be wiped out, and that this infinite woe of the enslaved cannot be removed or even mitigated, and that this mighty demoralization of the free cannot be arrested, and that these appalling convulsions of the nation can neither be averted nor delayed by any party, that aims at less than the immediate and entire abolition of slavery, how could we consent to be a party of any lower aims? Believing all this, we must go straight forward in our work of righteousness and love—looking to the God of the oppressed to hold our hearts in deep unswerving sympathy with the oppressed—resolved on sparing no pains to get the Government of the country into the hands of the abolitionists—and leaving the whole responsibility of our failure (if failure there shall be) on those who refuse to go with us.

We this day place before you our candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States. We beseech you to delay not one month to call a Convention in each of your States to nominate Electors for these candidates. In such States as Kentucky and Virginia, where but few dare avow themselves to be abolitionists, we, nevertheless, expect those few to nominate an Electoral ticket. In such States as South Carolina and Georgia, where terror of the slave-power shuts the lips of all abolitionists, we, of course, expect no Electoral tickets.

We say nothing of our candidates, for the good reason that nothing need be said. They speak for themselves. Their principles speak for them. Their lives speak for them. Give them the official power, which we ask for them, and their use of that power will also speak for them. We have discharged our duty in presenting these candidates. It remains with our countrymen to assume the responsibility of rejecting them, or to bless mankind and honor God by electing them.

Editors friendly to the "Abolition" movement, or willing to give their readers correct information concerning it, are respectfully requested to republish the preceding Address; which they can easily do, by dividing it into

two or more portions. As a historical record, merely, it is worth preserving, even by those who dissent, strongly, from its positions.

MINUTES

OF THE

NATIONAL ABOLITION CONVENTION.

THIS Convention assembled in Market Hall, in the city of Syracuse, N.Y. on Wednesday, the 28th of May, 1856. It was well attended by abolitionists from different states. At 10 o'clock, A. M., Lewis Tappan, of New York, called the Convention to order, and moved a temporary organization by calling Joseph Plumb, of New York, to the chair. Seconded and carried.

M. B. Williams of New York, was appointed temporary secretary.

T. B. McCormick of Ohio, addressed the Throne of Grace.

On motion, a committee was appointed to report names of officers for the permanent organization of the Convention. This committee consisted of: Abram Pryne of Ohio, William Goodell of New York, Henry Catlin of Pennsylvania, J. W. Loguen of New York, and Silas Hammond of New York. During the retirement of the committee, Thomas B. McCormick, formerly of Kentucky, now of Ohio, addressed the Convention. He gave a brief and eloquent recital of the facts of his persecution and virtual expulsion from the State of Indiana, at the dictation of the slaveholders of Kentucky. He exhibited fairly and dispassionately, the tyrannical and cruel spirit of slavery, and concluded by saying that in its utter abolition, only, is there safety.

The Committee on Nominations reported the names of Joseph Plumb of New York for President, and Henry Catlin of Pennsylvania, for Secretary of the Convention. The report was accepted and adopted. Subsequently (on further report of the Committee) Lewis Tappan of New York, T. B. McCormick of Ohio, A. B. Burdick of Rhode Island, J. R. Forest of Vermont, L. H. Pratt of Pennsylvania, and C. C. Foote of Michigan, were elected Vice-Presidents, and W. W. Chapman of New York, additional Secretary.

A Business Committee was appointed, consisting of William Goodell, Gerrit Smith, Lewis Tappan, Frederick Douglass and Samuel Salisbury, who, after consultation, reported that an address had been prepared and would be presented on the opening of the afternoon session.

Lewis Tappan of New York made a few felicitous remarks embodying sentiments of radical reform. He believed slavery would not be abolished in this country until the sympathy of the nation is aroused to extirpate it.

By request of a member of the Convention, the Secretary read the Call for the Convention.

Lewis Tappan then read letters to the meeting from Francis L. Capen of Massachusetts, and Charles Stuart of Canada. These letters were full of sympathy and encouragement.

George W. Clark then favored the audience with an excellent song—words from that poet of freedom, John G. Whittier.

James C. Jackson, of Glen Haven, N. Y., followed in an address of much strength and point. He was repeatedly applauded.

Abram Pryne addressed the meeting in favor

of using physical force, at the present crisis in Kansas.

Lewis Tappan replied, advocating peaceful measures, to which Mr. Pryne rejoined, asserting that this is a civil revolution, not a moral one.

Wm. Goodell said, that ballots are more effective than bayonets.

Frederick Douglass advocated resistance at the proper time, which had not yet come. On motion, the Convention adjourned to 2 o'clock P. M.

Afternoon Session, 2 o'clock.

Gerrit Smith of the Business Committee, reported an address to the abolitionists of the United States.

Lewis Tappan read a summary of the address.

On motion, the report of the business committee was accepted.

On a motion, for adopting the address, Frederick Douglass briefly addressed the Convention, and introduced Peter H. Clark of Ohio, who made remarks in favor of adopting the address. Mr. Douglass followed.

Mr. Warren of New York made a brief speech, and George W. Clark followed with a song. Convention adjourned to 7½ o'clock P. M.

Evening Session, 7½ o'clock.

Meeting commenced at the hour specified.

A large audience were in attendance. Addresses were made by Beriah Green, W. J. Watkins, and Frederick Douglass.

Lewis Tappan presented resolutions of sympathy and condolence with Hon. Chas. Sumner, which were unanimously adopted by the Convention, as follows:

Resolved, That we hold in grateful admiration the character of the Hon. Charles Sumner; that we honor the splendid services he has rendered to the cause of Liberty; that we deeply sympathize with him in his present sufferings, in consequence of the cowardly and brutal attack of the villain who dared to assault the intrepid advocate of the slave in the American Senate Chamber; and that we hope and pray that Mr. Sumner's valuable life will be spared until he shall witness the complete overthrow of the execrable system that now brutalizes our brethren in bondage and brutalizes their oppressors, and disgraces our country.

Resolved, that the above resolution be duly attested by the President, Vice-Presidents and Secretaries of this Convention, and transmitted to Mr. Sumner.

On motion, the Convention adjourned until 9 o'clock the next morning.

Second day, Morning Session.

The Convention met in Corinthian Hall at 9 o'clock, and was opened by prayer by A. B. Burdick, of Rhode Island.

W. W. Chapman, of New York, moved that the Convention nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States, at 11 o'clock A. M. Carried.

G. W. Clark, sung a song.

Mr. Taft of New York addressed the Convention in behalf of Kansas.

Abram Pryne spoke in regard to that portion of the Address which refers to the exercise of physical force in the defence of freedom

in the impending crisis, and was followed by remarks from Gerrit Smith, W. O. Duvall, David Plumb, Lewis Tappan, and others.

Mr. Pryne moved to amend the Address, by making it assert, unequivocally, that we will sustain the freemen of Kansas, by force of arms, in defending themselves against its assaults of the slave power.

William Goodell objected. He said that one object of this Convention was to obtain possession of the Federal Government, and with it to suppress slavery throughout the country—not to arm ourselves and march to Kansas.

Mr. Pryne replied with much spirit. Mr. Goodell moved to amend the amendment, by referring the subject back to the Business Committee, with instructions to make such changes as it may deem proper.

Gerrit Smith said the proposal of Mr. Pryne was inappropriate to this Convention, and he moved to lay both the amendments on the table. Amended by moving to lay the Address upon the table. Carried.

Moved to proceed to the consideration of the finances. Carried.

Mr. Goodell then spoke in reference to the necessity of supporting the cause by our money. Lecturers must be employed, and presses sustained. His appeal for material aid was a strong one. Mr. Tappan continued on the same topic.

A Committee on Finance was appointed, consisting of C. C. Foote, A. Pryne, G. W. Clark, William J. Watkins and W. O. Duvall. The Committee proceeded to take subscriptions and collect moneys.

The hour appointed for making the nominations having arrived, Lewis Tappan of New York moved the nomination, by the Convention, of Gerrit Smith of New York, for President of the United States.

Pending this motion, remarks were made by Messrs. Pryne, Duvall, Forest, Randall and others. The vote was taken, and Gerrit Smith was unanimously nominated.

Gerrit Smith responded by thanking the Convention for the honor conferred on him, but expressed his desire to be excused. The Convention, however, by a vote, declined excusing him.

Ernest Helle, a German citizen, expressed himself highly gratified with the nomination of Gerrit Smith, and avowed his belief that the German population generally would give him their support.

On motion, Samuel McFarland of Pennsylvania was unanimously nominated for Vice President.

The consideration of the address was then resumed, when Gerrit Smith moved to amend the amendment of Wm. Goodell (referring Mr. Pryne's amendment of the address to the Business Committee,) by laying it, together with Mr. Pryne's amendment, on the table. Carried.

On motion, the Address was adopted unanimously by the Convention.

On motion, a National Committee was appointed, which was constituted as follows :

William Goodell, of New York, chairman; Thomas Cushing, Maine; Daniel Foster, Massachusetts; John R. Forest, Vermont; A. G. Beman, Connecticut; A. B. Burdick, Rhode Island; Arthur Tappan, New Jersey; George

F. Horton, Pennsylvania; A. Pryne, Ohio; C. C. Foote, Michigan; H. O. Wagoner, Illinois; L. P. Frost, Wisconsin; S. M. Bell, Virginia.

On motion, the Committee was empowered to fill vacancies.

On motion, a vote of thanks was tendered to the officers of the Convention, for the able discharge of their duties.

On motion, the Convention adjourned *sine die*.

JOSEPH PLUMB, Pres't.
H. CATLIN, } Secretaries.
W. W. CHAPMAN,

LETTERS READ IN THE CONVENTION.

BAY POINT, Boston, May 26th, 1856.

Dear and Honored Sir—Till to day, I have looked forward with joy to the Syracuse Convention on the 28th inst., but now I see I am doomed to be disappointed. Every day, for the last ten years, has seemed more critical than

its forerunner, and what can exceed in awful moment the present crisis? I can appreciate something of the mingled feelings that move you when you contemplate the last outrage against liberty in the American Senate. But is it anything else than transpires daily in Kansas and on every plantation under that most nefarious despotism, slavery? May it convince the North and the country that no *selfish* seeking, no *selfish* enjoyment of liberty can be blessed of God, and therefore neither peaceful, permanent or safe. The justice of Heaven forbids the security of rights and freedom North and West, while the helpless slave, our brother, is doomed to *hopeless* bondage. Before the doctrine of "*No interference with slavery in the old States*," can be true, we must not only abolish the Constitution, but repeal the moral law, abolish Christianity, and reconstruct human nature.

It may be a question worthy the serious consideration of the Convention, whether an absolute, thorough and effectual non-extension of slavery would not prove a death-blow struck at the most *vital* point, since extension opens new markets, increases the demand, keeps up the price, enhances the value of the slave, and so feeds the pockets and stimulates the money motive, that strongest passion of the human heart, and one of the two great inducements of the slaveholder to hug the institution. The other great motive is *political control*, and this is fed by extension, and choked to death by non-extension.

But I conceive the first great duty of the Convention to be to affirm the highest principles, take the purest stand, and do all that can be done to bring the country up to that point.

It is fatal to our cause that the friends of freedom are a "House divided against itself." All we need is a UNITED NORTH; and the truest and best STEP for the first of a series, is that on which the army of freedom can be united. "Forbid them not," said Christ, "for he that is not against us is on our side."

With my fullest sympathies for the objects of the Convention, accept my best wishes for its success, and my sincere regards for yourself,

Most respectfully,
FRANCIS L. CAPEN.

HON. GERRIT SMITH.

P. S. Please express my cordial fellowship

with the friends of *utter, immediate* Radical Abolition. And may the blessing of God go with you.

LORA, U. C., May 21st, 1856.

My beloved and honored Brother—Fundamental to the happiness of mankind, as civil government is, yet unspeakably more important is it, that they into whose hands that mighty instrument for good or for evil is committed, should be persons fearing God and working righteousness; a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well; lovers in heart and deed, of man, as man; not as being white or black, or learned or ignorant, or rich or poor; but as being all alike immortal and accountable creatures; or if there be any difference, it is, that, as the poor, and ignorant, and low in life, have less power to protect themselves, their lawful rights and interests should be the more scrupulously watched over by the lawful authorities.

In view of these simple axioms of universal manhood, I hail with gratitude your call for a national nominating Convention, at Syracuse, on the 28th of this month; and earnestly pray for the Divine guidance and blessing upon all its proceedings. Were I your fellow subject, I should deem it one of my most sacred duties to attend; for in proportion as your nation is mighty, so is the vital importance of wielding its might in thorough subserviency heartfully to truth, and love, and equity, and freedom; all partiality and hypocrisy being utterly spurned and cast aside.

The oppression of the poor, especially in the supremely aggravated form in which it exists in the slave-system of your country is death, as far as it goes, to all true religion, to all genuine humanity, to whatever deserves the name of justice or of law, and to every sound and holy feeling of the human heart. Slavery and liberty cannot co-exist without such a compromise as falsehood and truth might make together, falsehood hoodwinking truth; or as love trampled upon by hatred, might palm upon a bleeding and doubly degraded world.

In struggling as you are doing, for the deliverance of your country, you are struggling for the virtue and happiness of the world. As a man, I have a vital interest in it, although as a foreigner, I should be an intruder. To you, in all your politico-moral anti-slavery efforts, the holy and glorious cause, with your companions in it, is eminently committed; for in you and them, alone, I find that thorough rejection of all compromise with sin, which carries no lie in its right hand to mutilate and pollute its object, if obtained, or destroy it altogether. God is with you—humanity is with you—the real Church of Christ, under whatever name, is with you—the Bible, unperverted, is with you—justice and liberty and truth and love, are at your sides. Go on, trusting in God, and ever spurning all compromise with the world, the flesh and the devil. If you succeed, a new morn of brightness and beauty will dawn upon your country and the world. If you fail, the existing darkness of hypocrisy and despotism must be deepened; but the angelic shout of martyr-victory, will rise from your seeming fall, your real triumph, to the realms of everlasting bliss.

Present with you, in heart and prayer, though absent in body,

C. STUART.

HON. G. SMITH.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, JUNE 2, 1856.

NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

CIRCULAR OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

To the Abolitionists of the United States:

The National Abolition Convention, assembled at Syracuse, N. Y., May 28th and 29th, 1856, having nominated Gerrit Smith of N. York for President, and Samuel Mc Farland, of Pennsylvania for Vice-President of the United States, appointed the undersigned a National Committee, to promote the objects of said Convention.

It is earnestly recommended, by the National Convention, that State Conventions of abolitionists in favor of said nominations, be held as soon as possible, in each state, to select presidential electors for the several districts, and to take efficient measures for printing and distributing tickets, and otherwise laboring to secure their election. The time and place of holding said Conventions in each state, will be designated and notified by the member of this committee residing in the state. In states wherein no member of this Committee resides, the friends of the cause will please consult and notify a State Convention. Every thing, almost, depends upon the local activity and vigilance of the friends of the cause, in the different states, counties, towns, cities and villages.

WILLIAM GOODELL, of New York,
Chairman of the Committee.

THOMAS CUSHING, Maine.

DANIEL FOSTER, Massachusetts.

JOHN R. FOREST, Vermont.

A. G. BEMAN, Connecticut.

A. B. BURDICK, Rhode Island.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, New Jersey.

GEORGE F. HORTON, Pennsylvania.

A. PRYNE, Ohio.

C. C. FOOTE, Michigan.

H. O. WAGONER, Illinois.

L. P. FROST, Wisconsin.

S. M. BELL, Virginia.

Letters, and remittances for the National Committee, (including subscriptions made at the National Nominating Convention at Syracuse) should be directed to the chairman of the Committee, William Goodell, Box 1212, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York. All the funds furnished will be promptly and faithfully expended to carry on the campaign vigorously, by circulating publications, and otherwise.

THE NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTION,

Held at Syracuse, N. Y. May 28th and 29th, was unusually interesting and spirited. Before the close of the morning session, on the first day, the Hall was very nearly filled, notwithstanding the heavy showers of rain. In the afternoon there was a full audience including a considerable numbers of ladies from the city and country adjacent. In the evening, the attendance was still greater, and nearly all the evening, many were seen standing, who could not conveniently be seated.

The "Republican" State Convention had been in session the same day, only a few rods distant, and a lecture or address by Horace Greeley had been announced, and was delivered the same evening. After nine o'clock consider-

able numbers who had been listening to Mr. Greeley came in and swelled our Convention, which was continued with increasing interest until about half-past ten, when it was adjourned to ten o'clock the next morning, and the discussions were vigorously resumed. A "Republican" delegate who is leaning towards radical abolitionism, and who divided his time between the two conventions, confessed to us that our convention was quite as numerously attended as theirs, and was marked by greater enthusiasm as well as by a richer variety of talent, as elicited in the discussion.

At the Onondaga Temperance House, where delegates to the two conventions commingled, the topics embraced in the doings of our convention were the general theme of conversation, and the tone of dissent from our sentiments was faint. With the dissentients, the only questions propounded were, whether our movements were not premature, and whether we ought not to wait and see if the Philadelphia Convention would not come up to our ground. Even in the "Republican" convention, *our* convention was adverted to, as a body occupying a higher position than theirs. In the city and region of the "Jerry rescue," the region wherein, (as some pretend) our "ultraisms had injured the cause," the Republican organization lives only by approximating towards our standard, and proudly points to the "radical" speech of its Gen. Granger.

The ill-health of Gerrit Smith, who was laboring under a severe cold, prevented him from saying much in the convention, or even reading the address reported by him. There were, however, an abundance of eloquent speakers, and the Address was very distinctly and impressively read by Col. Charles D. Miller, son-in-law of Mr. Smith. It presented the topics of the discussion that followed, and its positions were thoroughly canvassed. We need not dwell on its distinctive characteristics. It speaks for itself, and our readers will judge for themselves. Some of its trains of thought may seem novel and startling to some of our friends in some parts of the country. But no one in the Convention objected to any portion of it, on that ground, or because it was too revolutionary and daring. The only amendment proposed was one in quite a different direction. Mr. Pryne and a few others thought it defective in not giving direct and emphatic encouragement to the immediate employment of physical force to rescue Kansas. The debate on this point was, for a time, quite stirring, and questions of order arose frequently. But the best spirit pervaded the whole, and the conclusion was reached with a good degree of unanimity in the end.

The solemnity of the occasion was deepened by the telegraphic communications from Washington city, concerning the critical condition of Senator Sumner, and from Kansas, respecting the outrages perpetrated upon the citizens of Lawrence. A telegraphic dispatch from Boston, announcing the rejection, by the Congregational body, as their representative in the Tract Society, of the Reverend Doctor Nehemiah ("South Side") Adams, was communicated by Lewis Tappan, and gave great satisfaction.

The composition and the tone of the Convention partook largely of the religious element. A considerable number of ministers of the Gos-

pel were present, as active members. The session was opened with prayer, and, on both mornings, nearly an hour was occupied by members of the Convention, in meetings for prayer, before the time for opening the sessions of the Convention.

Additional interest was imparted by the presence and co-operation of several talented German citizens, one of whom, Mr Helde, addressed the Convention with great force of thought and language, which made a very marked and happy impression. The co-operation of our German fellow-citizens was felt to be an object of great importance, and it was fairly claimed in the address that ours is the only political party in America that can meet the wants or enlist the sympathies of European emigrants who come to this country desiring to find with us a home for liberty, an asylum from oppression.

The presence and prominent participancy, in our discussions and proceedings, of so many gifted colored citizens, was another feature of our Convention, which distinguished it from the conventions of any other political party in the country, and marked our distinctive enterprize, as the only political movement for the promotion of impartial freedom and equal rights, irrespective of birth, race, or complexion. It is the Abolition party, and none other, that welcomes and attracts to its Conventions, the proscribed class, including fugitives from slavery. This feature of our movement is full of encouragement, and may well inspire cheerful hope. The party that would successfully contend with the slave power, must embody, conspicuously, its natural opponents, its despised victims. Failing in this, by becoming "the party of the white man," it fails vitally, losing the favor of the God of the oppressed, and the confidence of all true and seeing men.

Nothing could exceed the unanimity and heartiness of the nominations. There were no rival candidates in the field, as in the other parties, with their opposing cliques, and subtle stratagems. The people came there to nominate, for President, Gerrit Smith. It was natural that he should wish to be excused; equally natural that the Convention should decline excusing him, and that he should silently acquiesce. The selection of a candidate for Vice-President, occupied a few minutes. Two other names were mentioned, but not earnestly insisted upon. After a brief consultation, a motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously, nominating Samuel McFarland of Pennsylvania. If less extensively known than Gerrit Smith, he is more extensively known than some candidates for that office—successful candidates, too,—that might be mentioned. He is a candidate well deserving our support. His residence is so near to the Virginia line, that we might almost call him our Virginian candidate, if it were thought specially desirable to select one from that quarter.

The nominations are made. It only remains for the friends of their country and of the slave to give them their united and enthusiastic support. Under the good Providence of God, the election of them is by no means impossible, in the midst of the wonderful events that are taking place.

One thing, at least, the abolitionists, if true to their professions, might easily do. They might secure for these candidates such a support as almost to ensure their election, if nominated, four years hence.